759
465

in the khwan khăo "gift" handy cash. The income was about 40 to 200 baht ($2.00 to $20.00) per year.

759
84

The duties of a midwife were not time consuming if all went well. There was practically no pre-natal care, and a few hours of care was given for only three days after birth. If complications arose, though, the midwife spent long hours away from home. In fact the husband of one midwife grumbled, "You don't receive anything, and just waste time. Sometimes you stay away over night, and no one watches the house or the children."

759
571

In their social role, midwives felt personal but not group solidarity. A solid bond existed between an older midwife and the particular younger one to whom he or she had given training and magic. Those related by blood or marriage sometimes worked together, and even turned over cases to each other if outside demands became pre-eminent. If in trouble on a case, midwives did not call on each other unless as close, affectionate relatives but turned rather for help from a mŏ or to the Minburi Health Center. Yet sometimes rivalry was severe. If the family of the parturient felt that no progress was being made with one midwife, they called in another and another. Each did his utmost and then stepped down when it had to be admitted, "My magic is not enough." The final expert who brought mother and baby through before the deposed midwives glowed inwardly with pride and skill and satisfaction that the magic of his particular teacher had proved effective. The sharpness of the competition reverberated through the words, "I pushed the other midwives down." Community standing or "face" was not lost by an unsuccessful case because of the midwives' fundamental role as helpers only, their faith in their own experiences, and again, the conviction that the course of childbirth was merit-determined.

[756]
[845]
[743]
[578]

759
554
152
789

759
554
572

Though living like other elder citizens of the community, in their social role they were more respected. Known as selfless donors of time and energy for the sake of others, whose successes gave proof of merit and nurturing capacity, they were viewed as assets to the community. In spite of competition considerable affection was evident between some. They were elders before a sea of youth, old friends who had for years lived and farmed side by side, met at ceremonies, and shared many experiences.

759

If the case were in difficulty sometimes a mŏ was called, sometimes a midwife or even both. What was the nature of their respective specialties? What in fact made certain midwives "professionals" (tham ăchīp [Mc.F. 990]) when others who had equal or more experience were not so considered?

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

fictive terms is of course sometimes prompted by nothing more than the desire to be polite, but equally often it symbolizes genuine feelings of affection and obligation not too different from what the terms imply when they are used in their original kinship context. Bang Chaners have a wonderfully convenient term, *phyan-yaad*, a compound meaning literally "family friends," which is used to refer both to friends to whom ego feels so close that he considers them members of his family and to individuals whom he considers his friends *because* they are members of his family. The particular persons to whom this term, as well as those noted above, is applied vary widely from informant to informant (expectedly so because they are non-institutionalized terms). However, the point to be emphasized is that for all villagers kinship provides a basic referential mechanism for expressing the degree of psychological affiliation that they feel toward other human beings.

An *awareness* of degrees of psychological affiliation and obligation and of the modes for expressing such sentiments are very much a part of village life. For with the exception of the five institutions mentioned above, most Bang Chaners, as I have noted elsewhere (Sharp *et al.* 1956: 241), are really not obliged—and do not feel obliged—to be beholden to anyone but themselves. In a very real sense, the village is comprised of 1,771 individualists whose major goals in life are to obtain sufficient land to support themselves, their growing children, and their religion, free from physical insecurities and unencumbered by entangling social obligations. When they enter into relationships with other people they do so with an awareness that they are always acting of their own free will.

Despite the conventions of ethnographic reporting, it is difficult to delimit the precise nature of the nuclear family in Bang Chan. The nuclear family clearly is the ideal for all villagers, but because Bang Chaners are just as responsive to convenience as they are to custom, there is considerable variation regarding this ideal. In his study of the economy of the village, Janlekha (1955) found it necessary to distinguish five different kinds of functioning, mutually exclusive household units in Bang Chan: the typical nuclear family (59.4 percent of all households); a limited extended family, consisting of a man, wife, either or both their sets of parents, and unmarried children (8.1 percent); an extended family, consisting of the limited extended family plus married children, the latters' children, and any collateral relatives of any generation (26.8 percent); a one-person family (5.4 percent); and the ecclesiastical "family," consisting of the order of Buddhist monks, the only truly corporate group in the village (0.3 percent). (These variations of the nuclear family, all localized groups, should of course not be confused with what I, following Sharp [1957], have been calling the kindred, with what Kaufman [1960] refers to as spatially and

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

596 602 *156 [609] and not only in the abstract, symbolic sense. Non-kin are approached in the hope that they eventually may be treated as kin; good government officials are unabashedly described as being like "good fathers"; the basic patterns of respect that are learned and practiced in the family are extended to relationships outside of it, although inevitably in more formal ways. There is no *rigid* psychological cleavage between the sentiments of kinship and the sentiments about individuals outside of the family. Conversely the mere fact of kinship does not assure that individuals will be given special emotional treatment: often the love between friends is greater than the love between kin (see the case of "Dang," his father, and father's friends in Hanks and Phillips 1961, or the case cited earlier of the man who left his wife because of his fondness for an employer). Kinship represents to the villager relationships of warmth, familiarity, and conviviality, but also unpredictability and undependability. Such is the nature of most human contact in Bang Chan.

596 602 609 *156 [592]

621 596 [662] *[156] In this type of cultural situation, one does *not* find arising the type of community power struggles or schisms apparently characteristic of many peasant communities (see Foster 1960–61). Bang Chan is indeed a placid community because no family has the organizational means or the quality of familial cohesiveness necessary to assume a dominant social, political, or economic position. Individuals assume important positions and individuals disagree and squabble, but rarely families. In surveying the cultural landscape of Bang Chan, I often wondered whether the basic unit of anthropological and sociological, as well as psychological, analyses was perhaps not the individual rather than the family, monastery, school, or village itself.

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan
Thailand AO1

4. The good person is one who tries to behave in an honest way.
5. Do not shove anything at anybody or throw anything at anybody.
6. Do not make loud noises when people are working.
7. Do not spit or clear your phlegm or yawn in public.
8. Do not gobble your food or scatter things on your plate or chew loudly.
9. Do not sit or walk carelessly or abruptly against other people.
10. Do not touch or horse-play with people who are your close friends.
11. If you are a superior, wherever you go, you should look after the comfort of your inferior.

Again, although the list is almost self-explanatory, note should be taken of some cultural emphases that run through several of the items: the stress on behaving properly toward superordinates and subordinates; the emphasis upon motoric and emotional self-discipline, and conversely, the implicit fear of losing control over one's impulses (as indicated in the dictum against horseplay, even with one's friends); the general stress of respecting the inviolability of every person; and finally, the great emphasis on the importance of the body in human behavior and social relationships. Although this last point may not seem unusual, in that the dicta are addressed to children—with whom one would expect much concern over the body—it in fact represents an area about which all Thai regardless of age are sensitive. In general Siamese, considerably more than Occidentals, tend to be aware of physical bearing, beauty, and ugliness, as well as the use of the body as a communicative device. A person's physical appearance is an indication of his character, particularly his moral nature, and kinesthetic modes are explicitly used for conveying love, regard, and as suggested above, disrespect.[2]

It is worth reëmphasizing that the above items are standards for, not descriptions of, behavior. The attention given to controlling body movements is simply to emphasize for the child that people will decide whether he is good or bad on the basis of the way he handles his body, and he must therefore exercise extreme care in its use. Items one, nine, and ten are not meant to imply anything fundamentally wrong with touching another. Most Thai, particularly members of the same sex, thoroughly enjoy expressing their mutual affection through bodily contact: by holding hands, grasping the leg or arm of the other, and in Bang Chan, sometimes by sleeping with one another. In the last instance, there is absolutely no sexual contact; often during the cold season the practice serves not only friendship ——— but the additional purpose of keeping the participants warm.

[2] Although it belongs to a different area of behavior, it is not insignificant that in classical Thai dance every body movement—the configuration of the hands, the position of the legs, eye movements—has a specific, conventionalized meaning. In the oldest, or *Kon*, version of the dance, the only means of communication other than that provided by masks are body movements.

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

it in fact so rarely takes place. In fact, the "hypotheses" of these women are perfect manifestations of what, in the technical sense, is *anxiety* rather than *fear* about what might occur.) The marital situations of both these women have since been routinized so that they have come to accept the second wives as part of their normal domestic lives. However, the vehemence with which they report these incidents indicates that at the time they paid for their wish to avoid embarrassment with considerable psychic distress. In terms of the basic attitudes involved, these situations were not too unlike that which obtained for Dang: to avoid a potentially sticky social situation, politeness and complete silence were maintained.

Somewhat different order from the above are the numerous instances where "good friends" will avoid reporting to each other unhappy or distressing information although it is clearly to the other's advantage to have such information in order better to cope with the difficulty. In one case, a villager had been working for weeks on a land sale deal which would have netted him a brokerage fee of two thousand *baht* (approximately one hundred dollars, a considerable sum in a community where the average annual family income is, before expenses, only eighty-five hundred *baht*). A friend had meanwhile learned that another villager, with whom he was not at all close, had sweet-talked the customer into permitting him to handle the sale, much to the detriment of his own friend, the original broker. However, rather than warn the friend of what was happening, he simply said nothing. When asked to explain why he kept his silence, he said that he was just too *ʔaaj* to speak up. Although the consequences of "ʔaaj-ness" were in this case more extreme than usual, the situation itself was not. In another, less dramatic instance a villager mentioned to us that in coming across the rice fields that afternoon he had noticed that his neighbor's windmill had broken down. The belt connecting the windmill to the irrigating machine used in raising water into the fields had slipped from the drive shaft. However, despite the obvious importance of this fact to his neighbor—the planting of his rice seedlings was completely dependent on the noria raising a sufficient amount of water into the field at the right time—the friend failed to tell his neighbor what had happened. When asked why, he said that he was *ʔaaj* about making his friend unhappy.

What is important about the above illustrations is not so much their typicality—one can cite instances where friends are considerably more realistic and helpful—but rather the legitimacy of the rationalizations of the inactive friends. All Bang Chaners can understand and accept the reluctance of a villager to be the person who actually triggers off another individual's discomfort. There is a genuine (albeit misplaced) sense of responsibility about not making another unhappy. What is important is the immediate, face-to-face situation. If a person must ultimately suffer, that is his own problem; but at least the friend can say, "I did not 'cause' it."

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

1923–1924], translated by Cunnison) and Homans (1961) have argued, that human relationships everywhere are based on just such a consideration, usually concealed by ethically palatable amenities (such as in American culture, from which most of Homans' empirical materials come). However, what is so intriguing about the Thai case is that *quid pro quo* factors are forever in mind as justifications and explanations of why people relate to one another. Although villagers, because they are such polite people, rarely say to others, "I am helping you because I know the day will come when I need your help," or "Do this for me because you owe me a favor," they do use such arguments *to explain* the basis of their ties: "Of all my friends I love Lek the most because she has done me the most favors (*bunkhuns*)"; "The purpose of marriage is to have a companion who will take care of you when you get sick"; "Of all my daughters, the one who gives me the greatest pleasure is the one who sells things. . . . When she gets money she gives it to me"; "Friends are very useful because it means that you have people who will do you favors. And when they need help, you will take care of them. This is love." [21]

One of the finest discussions of the nature of reciprocal obligations appears in a recent paper by George M. Foster (1961) that deals not with a Thai community, but with the Mexican village of Tzintzuntzan. Foster outlines in his paper the notion of the "dyadic contract" which he presents as a model for the social structure of Tzintzuntzan. Or, more precisely: "Specifically, I suggest a model . . . to reconcile the institutionalized roles which can be recognized and described in the community with the underlying principle which gives the social system coherence." Foster's focus thus differs somewhat from our psychological emphasis. However, his abstract statement of the "dyadic contract" provides such an excellent summation of the major factor making for enduring social relationships in Bang Chan that it merits quoting in detail here. There are of course inevitable differences in cultural content between the two communities and the fact that

[21] Such explanations are not unique to Bang Chan. In his description of the Thai-Lue village of Ban Phaed in Northern Thailand, Moerman (1962) observes: "The society of Ban Phaed operates in terms of something got for every something given. This is not merely an analytic device which permits a predictive, if crass, view of any human society. It is the way in which villagers explain and evaluate their own behavior. Favor for favor, visit for visit, meal for meal, one should return what he receives. 'We help our kinsmen because they help us. If a kinsman however close didn't help me, I wouldn't help him.' 'We care for our children when they are young; they will care for us when we are old.' Actions which we would justify in terms of compassion, generosity, public-spirit, patriotism, pride in a job well done, the Lue villager speaks of in terms of reciprocal, short-term self-interest. Their actions are no more selfish than ours. Far from it. But the moral rhetoric of a Lue villager is different from our own. In politics, economics, family life, and religion it focuses on something got for something given."

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

goodness when he is old and can no longer work"; "if you are a male, you must get ordained to redeem the sins of the parents. Just like sending them money." Many of the responses included in this category do not refer explicitly to the reciprocity of the child, but are phrased in terms of the *bunkhuns* that the parent has done for the child. Because the term *bunkhun* assumes reciprocity as part of its root meaning—good deeds which are reciprocated—references to the *bunkhuns* of the parents are included here. All told, 43 percent of the sample fall into this obligation category on the "mother" item and 50 percent on the "father" item.

The entire discussion above leads to the proposition that if the premise of reciprocity did not play such a major role in the villagers' assumptive world, there would be a few more informants who would be willing to perceive their parents as living an existence independent of themselves, and fewer informants so concerned with repaying their parents for fulfilling what is, after all, the parents' primary psychosocial role. Such a concern is likely to arise only when there is an underlying awareness that the parents have an option of fulfilling or not fulfilling their role, and that this has been impressed on the individual so dependent upon their choice.

The next item, in its manifest purpose and in its diversity of response, is less emotionally loaded than the above. In fact, perhaps the major function of the item, *"A real close friend is one who . . ."* (and its companion piece, *"The thing I want most in my closest friend is . . . ,"* which is so similar in response it will not be presented), is to indicate that there are no widely shared notions of a "real close friend" in Bang Chan. Whether this suggests that the figure of the "close friend" is unimportant to the villagers is uncertain. However, the diversity of the villagers' responses permits us to say relatively little about the typicality of the socially equal, yet dependent, figure in the village.[4]

Examination of the responses indicates that they fall into six different categories. Listed in the order of their frequency, "a real close friend is one who" has such qualities as faithfulness, loyalty, the willingness to die for his friend, and keeps his word (27 percent). Almost as many people (24 percent) agree that he is an individual who helps you, especially if you are poor or are in need of reminders to behave in a moral way. One informant in this category voices a definition of a "close friend" that I have heard on several occasions when villagers were discussing their relationships with kinsmen or neighbors: ". . . one who helps you when you are in trouble and goes away when you are happy." A third group (18 percent) perceives

[4] An earlier point by Hanks and Phillips (1961: 642) might not be insignificant in this regard. We noted that it "is difficult for an equal to give anything of value to an equal or to command his 'respect.' Indeed, he stands as a potential competitor for favors."

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

TABLE 10

*125 *A real close friend is one who . . .*
*129 *A real close friend is (namely) one who . . .*
*156
• 592

IS LOYAL	27%	is such that we love each other truly and would die for each other. is dependable, stays with you in suffering and in happiness, gives you useful advice about things, and loves you as you love him. is loyal.
IS HELPFUL:	24%	tells beneficial, helpful things to us. always helps *raw*. has sympathy; helps his friend when he is in trouble.
DOES NOT HARM SPEAKER:	18%	does not slander or blame *raw*. does not accuse *raw* falsely.
IS LIKE SPEAKER:	15%	loves me as I love him, has same thoughts, and speaks the same things.
LOVES SPEAKER:	10%	loves us very much. loves us, may risk his life for us, shares his food with us, does not take advantage of us, and tells his secrets to us.

a close friend as an individual who, from a positive point of view, does not slander, blame, quarrel with you, or accuse you falsely. This attention to the lack of negative qualities—as if negative qualities were people's given attributes—is repeated below in several items. A fourth group (15 percent) defines the close friend as an individual who is essentially the same as oneself, who enjoys doing the same things as oneself, or who enjoys sharing things with oneself. A fifth group (10 percent) considers the close friend to be simply a person who loves you, and a sixth group (only 2 percent) identifies the close friend as a member of his own family. Two of the idiosyncratic responses are interesting in their own right: one villager says, "I have never had any one like that at all. I have only ordinary friends"; and another says that only a person who is innocuous enough to "not bother anybody" could be considered a real close friend.

Despite their lack of consensus about the nature of a close friend, Bang Chaners do tend to agree about how they would respond *"when they found out that their best friend had spoken against them."* This item asks the villagers to state how they would behave in a situation that has *direct* relevance to them, in contrast to the above, which aims mainly at a definition of another party, albeit a party who would be expected to have some relevance to the self. However, the difference in the tone of response to the two items is striking. Here 66 percent of the sample responds with

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

125*
128*
156*
572*

immediate anger, declares that he will have nothing to do with the friend, or accepts the premise of the item as *prima facie* evidence of the friend's undesirability.

Only one of all the informants raises the possibility of there being some validity to the friend's remarks, and thus indicates some concern with the friend's *evaluation* of himself, as if his friend's opinion mattered to him. He says that he ". . . tried to find out whether there was any truth in what he said. If it was my fault, I would try to make it better and look for ways to come to an understanding." Four other villagers will go so far as to talk the matter over with the friend, but their phrasing indicates that they are concerned with finding out whether the friend did indeed say what he was reputed to say, rather than discussing the value of his remarks. Five other

TABLE 11

When he found out that his best friend spoke against him, he . . .
When finding out that raw *best friend speaks against* raw, raw . . .

ANGER:	66%	had to tell him off. A friend ought not to do that.
		felt angry with his friend and disliked him.
		was angry that his friend was a bad, bad person.
		was very angry and stopped going with him immediately.
		was angry.
TALK IT OVER:	10%	talked it over with him; talked about why he spoke against him.
		had to find out why his friend slandered him; if he was not a good man, he would stop being friends with him.
COUNSEL HIM:	13%	ought to advise him not to do it again.
		had to tell the friend to act correctly.
DISTRESS:	10%	felt *siacaj* (sorry, unhappy).

villagers also indicate a willingness to discuss the matter with the friend, but only to counsel him in the error of his ways: they are doing him the favor. It is probably not coincidental that four of these five counseling individuals are village monks. This is one of the few SCT items to which Buddhist monks, as a group, tend to give responses that are distinctively different from other informants. Finally, four villagers say that they are unhappy or distressed about the situation. A check of the translation of their responses indicates that although the reason for their distress is not absolutely certain, it can from the Thai point of view mean only that they are either unhappy about being slandered, or, like the preceding informants, unhappy *for* the friend; but it does not mean that they are unhappy

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

*125 *128 *156 • 572 about having lost a friend, or about the fact that it was a "friend" who had such an opinion. In this latter respect, their meaning would be similar to the response of one informant who said that he "felt very angry because it is quite common for others to slander him, but it is very low thing for friends to slander." In both cases, the premise of being spoken against is accepted and is given priority over the strength of the friendly relationship.

In fact, perhaps the most impressive thing about this entire distribution is the overwhelming acceptance of the premise and a concomitant indifference to the source of information or the nature of the evidence, whether it be against the friend or themselves. Only six villagers suggest that they are thinking along these lines, and only one addresses herself explicitly to the reliability of her informants, when she says that she ". . . paid no attention to what they said about her best friend (or what they said her best friend said)." It is as if hearing such things about friends, or discovering such things being said by friends, were indeed, as I originally suggested to the villagers, one of those "things that happen every day in life; just plain, ordinary things."

In any event, no villager except one ever entertains the possibility of there being any value in what the friend said. Any merit in the comment or any positive motive that the friend, in his role of friend, might have had, is assumed by the villagers to be inconsequential to the act performed. The fact of his being a "best friend" does not give him any special prerogatives. In fact, the villagers give such little attention to the fact of friendship in this situation that the experience emerges largely as one of insult, rather than rejection.

*125 *128 *156 The next two items differ from the preceding one in that the stakes in

TABLE 12

When he saw that they did not like him, he . . .
When seeing (realizing) that other khon *do not like* raw, raw . . .

WITHDRAWAL OR INDIFFERENCE:	60%	did not see them again. Oh! I don't feel anything. I never worry. did not go to have trouble with them. did not go to them; did not keep company with them. let them do as they pleased. He lived his own life. Who would say anything against him?
SELF-IMPROVEMENT:	15%	had to behave better. would try to improve himself, so that they would like him.
DISPLEASURE:	8%	was displeased, and did not like them either.
REGRET:	8%	felt sorry.

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

averages out to 40 percent.) There are no widely shared notions about the nature of a "close friend," an individual who, although a social equal, might be expected to be a source of dependence. When the quality of the friend's fellowship is challenged or placed in serious doubt, the majority of informants accept this as a reasonable possibility and exhibit little effort to reintegrate the social rupture that is thus created. In situations where the reasons for, and parties of, rejection are unknown, villagers respond with genuine self-confidence and equanimity. Excepting the "conception of friendship" item, predispositions in this area tend toward "unimodality," although not to the degree that we encountered in the area of authority.

Orienting Toward Others

The materials to be covered in this section aim mainly at the villagers' perceptions of the way human relations should be conducted and their notions of desirable and undesirable human qualities. To a certain extent, my purpose is to check how typical and representative many of the statements on interpersonal contact are that were made earlier in the text. However, two important points about the nature of this "check" are in order. First, it must be remembered that we are dealing here with the villagers' perceptions of desirable human qualities, not those that an outside observer identifies. Inevitably, there are certain areas that an outsider may consider primary, but which the villagers may simply take for granted, or vice versa. The complete absence of references to the desirability of *sanug* or being an "amusing talker" in the responses below is a case in point. Villagers, of course, are aware of the desirability of *sanug* and probably could not get along well without it. But the capacity to be "sanug-ful" is, in their environment, such a familiar and undistinguished human attribute that to them it does not merit being singled out for special regard. As a "check," therefore, these data serve mainly to identify any inconsistencies that may appear between our own perceptions and those of the villagers, rather than to provide full confirmation of the earlier observations. Likewise, it is possible that this material may reveal concerns not previously noted. Second, it should be clear that when there is confirmation, it will obviously be expressed in the villagers' idiom, not our own. Few informants below explicitly say that what they most like about others is their cordiality and affability. However, several (irrespective of sex) do say that they like the fact that others "talk sweetly," "are not coarse," or have "a soft and gentle way." This is their way of communicating the desirability of being polite and nonimposing toward others. Similarly, their indication that *"In their relations with people, the thing they are most careful of is . . .* talking to them correctly and properly"; ". . . manners and etiquette"; or

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

Thus, in explaining why he loves one of his closest friends, a villager says:

> We love each other because we never contradict each other or disagree. That is why we love each other. If we disagreed, there would be no love. [Investigator: "It is normal sometimes even for close friends to disagree. About what kind of things do you and your close friend disagree?"] We never disagree. Only people who are drunkards and take opium disagree. That is why our friendship has lasted so long. [Investigator: "What would happen if you disagreed?"] We would not love each other, and maybe he would take revenge on me.

In another place, this same informant says of his relationship with his wife: "My wife and I never quarrel. If we quarreled, we would have to separate. There would be nothing to divide—except the children." As indicated earlier, many villagers, fearing the volatility of a quarrel, actually do separate, often even before the dispute gets going. Similarly, individuals, particularly if they are in subordinate positions, hesitate even to approach others lest they stimulate, let alone elicit, anger. Villagers will hesitate to approach others even if they are not the object, but simply a possible catalyst, of another's potential aggression: witness the cases of the land sale deal and the broken noria cited earlier. Note that in these cases it is not manifest aggression but merely the anticipation of it that inhibits villagers from initiating or maintaining interpersonal involvements.

Although villagers decline to express or to be exposed to direct aggression, they do have several indirect, if somewhat more complicated, ways of venting these feelings. Of these, the simplest is to gossip nastily *about* people. The frequency of this characteristic peasant activity is considerable in the village: in fact, an uncharitable observer might, on the basis of Bang Chan, just as readily entitle a book about Thailand *Land of Gossip* as *Land of Smiles*. However, the very frequency of gossip seems to mitigate its intensity or effect. Villagers are so accustomed to it that it is almost a way of talking, a style of speech. And as is the case with much village speech, villagers listen to, but do not necessarily believe, the nasty things one person might say about another. Also, excepting those cases where a person's complaints are either realistic or justifiable, people are just as likely to listen to an individual's gossip for what it says about him as for what it says about the person whom he is criticizing. None of this is to suggest that the person gossiping does not attain release, or that the person about whom he is gossiping, *if* he found out, would not be hurt or peeved. Rather, it is the situation in which the hostility is expressed that mitigates its effect.

Less frequent and more painful than the above are the formal, almost

*178
212
369
402
484

as apt to adopt the motor irrespective of whether he has been in contact with urban culture.

TABLE 20. ILLITERATE FARMERS* WITH WIDER CULTURE CONTACTS ARE MORE LIKELY THAN OTHERS TO USE THE MOTOR

	Illiterate (Proportion using the motor)		Literate (Proportion using the motor)	
Trips to the airport				
None	38%	(40)	86%	(35)
One or more	63	(49)	86	(83)
Visits to the agricultural fair				
None	50%	(67)	85%	(76)
One or more	57	(24)	88	(43)

[562]
[241]
[228]
[244]

*Male farmers only

However, no such relationship was discerned between these culture contacts and trying out either fertilizer, tilapia, or mushrooms.

*178
124
369
433

Here again, is evidence to support the hypothesis that contacts with urban culture may act as a substitute for literacy in making the farmer more sophisticated about improving his standard of living and level of production. But the data show that such exposure need not result from direct physical contact with urban centers; it can, instead, be a result of indirect contact. Direct physical contact with urban culture, it turns out is effective in increasing the incidence of acceptance of the more complex innovations only for the illiterate farmers of Bang Chan.

*178
121
369
572

Friendships

The same reasoning which would lead one to expect a higher incidence of acceptance of innovations among those directly exposed to urban contacts would lead to the companion hypothesis: that inhabitants who have a greater degree of internal contacts with their friends and neighbors might tend to try out innovations to a greater extent than those who remain relatively aloof from such social contacts.

[402]
[228]
[241]
[244]

The data show that such contacts have a limited connection with acceptance of innovations. The incidence of motor use and tilapia raising is higher, it is true, among persons who report a wider sphere of social circulation; but there is little relation between social contacts and willingness to try out fertilizer or mushrooms.

178*
572
402
228
241
244
[125]

TABLE 21. INCIDENCE OF MOTOR USE IS HIGHER AMONG VILLAGERS WHO REPORT WIDER SOCIAL CONTACTS

	Social Contacts ("...Do you have more close friends than most people around here, or about the same as most people around here, or fewer close friends than most people around here?")	
	"More" or "the same" (143)	"Fewer" (55)
Motor		
Has used it	77%	55%
Never did	23	45
Tilapia		
Has tried it	39%	21%
Never did	61	79
Fertiliser		
Has used it	16%	11%
Never did	84	89
Mushrooms		
Has tried them	49%	40%
Never did	51	60

Once again, however, when this link between breadth of social contacts and use of the innovations is examined separately for the literate, compared with the illiterate farmers, we find further substantiation of the previous finding that under certain circumstances contact may act as a substitute for literacy in acceptance of complex innovations. For, although the link between social contacts and use of tilapia remains constant for literate as well as illiterate farmers, it is mainly for those who are illiterate that exposure to wider local social contacts is associated with greater incidence of motor use.

[212]

6: Goldsen and Ralis Z-4.3 (1955) 1957
AO7 Central Thai AO7

*178
212
• 572
402
228

TABLE 22. AMONG ILLITERATE FARMERS USE OF MOTOR IS LINKED TO WIDER SOCIAL CONTACTS

	Exposure to Influence of Others	
	Have more friends or about the same	Have fewer friends
	(Proportion who tried small motor)	
Literacy		
Illiterate	64% (56)	26% (27)
Literate	87 (86)	86 (78)
	(Proportion who tried tilapia)	
Illiterate	34% (56)	15% (28)
Literate	43% (86)	26 (27)

[369] This finding corroborates and expands the previous discussion of the culture contact and acceptance of innovations. Exposure to influence of others from outside the community (through contact with the city, with the airport, with the agricultural fair, for example), as well as exposure to the influence of others from within (through friends and associates) clearly relates to the decision to use an innovation such as the motor. Its effectiveness is not felt equally by the whole population, mainly instead, by those who are illiterate.

The significance of these internal and external contacts to illiterates may be that through such contacts they are likely to gain needed information and motivation which, if one can read and write, is available through other sources. If one cannot read and write, however, it is the outside world which provides this kind of needed information.

Capital Investment and Debt

426 Bang Chan s economy is largely a money economy and many farmers avail themselves of credit facilities through professional money lenders. Most loans are sought for the purpose of replacing capital equipment and purchasing land and buffalo.*

The present survey secures a rough measure of the extent of such borrowing in Bang Chan. The majority of farmers (39 per cent)

[113] * See Janlekha, Kamol O. A Preliminary Study of the Economic Conditions of Siamese Rice Farmers in Bang Chan, Thailand. M.S. Thesis Cornell University, 1951, p. 73.

* 178

743 Use of Health Facilities and Other Factors Associated With
241 Agricultural Innovations

• 572 Although use of the basic agricultural innovations was shown
426 to be linked to breadth of contacts within the community, on the one hand, and to indebtedness, on the other hand, the association between these factors and use of modern health facilities, although showing the same tendency, is not statistically significant. For the sake of completeness, the figures are reported below:

TABLE 34. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDEBTEDNESS OR INTERNAL SOCIAL CONTACTS AND USE OF HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

	"Have you ever been to a clinic or a hospital?"			
	No, Never	Yes, for treatment	Yes, for other reasons	Total 100%
Social Contacts				
"More friends"	31%	35%	34%	(62)
"The same"	40	35	25	(154)
"Fewer friends"	32	41	27	(94)
Do you now have a debt?				
No	40%	32%	28%	(140)
Yes	33	41	26	(192)

* 177
* 178
228
241
244
402
743

SUMMARY

1. In the community of Bang Chan in Central Thailand, various factors are studied statistically in order better to determine the conditions of acceptance of selected agricultural innovations and conditions for using the facilities of modern medicine in clinics and hospitals. Four agricultural innovations were selected, viz. gasoline motor, raising of fish (tilapia), use of fertiliser, and mushroom culture.

2. The present study was concerned with the initial adoption or trial of innovations, rather than the continuing use of these innovations or the merging of the new with the old features of the culture.

3. While adoption of the gasoline motor was associated with all other agricultural innovations, no generalised acceptance of the new was found because: a) adoption of the gasoline motor bore little or no relation to use of non-agricultural innovations such as hospital and clinic facilities; and b) adoption of gasoline motors was only weakly associated with raising of mushrooms.

4. A cluster of traits including high motivation and sizable capital outlay was associated with the use of the gasoline motor.

The motor users formed a group with higher economic level, greater literacy, higher acceptance of urban ways of life, more frequent exposure to mass media, broader social contacts within the community, and greater use of credit facilities. Illiterate farmers might also be motor users, if their contacts with urban centers were extensive.

5. Acceptance of mushroom culture was a special case of agricultural innovation: a) as distinct from all other attitudes toward innovation, mushroom growers were not marked by their high positive attitudes toward mushroom culture; b) the investment in mushroom raising per se was less than the investment and risk required by other types of agricultural innovation.

6. The mushroom growers as a group distinct from non-mushroom growers were more literate and acceptive of urban ways. Tilapia raisers were of a higher economic level and had greater community contacts than non-tilapia raisers.

7. An hypothesis was offered: that innovations differ in complexity and investment of effort required. The more complex presuppose greater investment, work, risk and postponement of returns; hence this complex kind requires greater motivation than the simpler ones such as mushroom raising.

8. Use of hospital and clinic facilities was more frequent among the literate, those exposed to mass media, those accepting of urban ways and those having greater contacts with the city. Unlike accepters of agricultural innovations, users of modern medical facilities were not of a higher economic level than non-users and could not be clearly distinguished on the basis of breadth of contact within the community or use of credit facilities.

197*
178*
207
213
228
241
244
369
434
454
743
426
546
572

125 29.d. IF R HAS SONS 20 AND UP: Of your sons over twenty, how many have been ordained as Buddhist priests, or not?

[793]	7.	DA 212
	8.	None 22
[593]	9.	One 58
	X.	Two 85
[792]	Y.	Three or more 16
[162]		

e. Do you have any sons under twenty?

	9.	Yes 188
	X.	No 108
	—	No Answer 37

[793] f. IF YES: In future, do you want your sons under twenty to be ordained as priests, or not?

[782]	Y.	Yes 186
	O.	No —
	—	No Answer 2

g. IF YES: But aside from your admirable desire to have them ordained, in your true heart how sure is your expectation? Are you very sure or not very sure, or fairly sure that they will be ordained?

	1.	Very sure 140
	2.	Not sure 26
	3.	Fairly sure 12
	4.	Unascertainable 9
		NA 1

h. All over Thailand there are some Thai men who are over 50 but have never been ordained as priests. For what various reasons might this happen?
(See code at end)

[461] 30. Suppose there was some work you could do individually, or that could be done in a small group of two or three, or that could be done in a large group. Which way would you prefer to do the work--as an individual, or in a group of two or three, or in a large group?

	8.	Individually 60
	9.	Small group 55
	X.	Large group 202
	Y.	Undecided, depends 4
	0.	Unascertainable 12

[572] 31. Around here in EC-KY there are some people who have many close friends and there are other people who have few close friends. And how about yourself? Do you have more close friends than most people around here, or about the same as most people around here, or fewer close friends than most people around here?

	5.	More than most 62
	6.	Fewer than most 94
	7.	About the same 154
	8.	Unascertainable 23